

July 20, 2000

MEMORANDUM TO: Joseph A. Murphy, Chairman
Committee to Review Generic Requirements

FROM: Ashok Thadani, Director **/RA/**
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research

SUBJECT: FEEDBACK ON CRGR REVIEW

During CRGR Meeting No. 342, on June 22, 1999, RES briefed the CRGR on two Commission papers: "Treatment of Voluntary Initiatives in Regulatory Analyses" and "Treatment of Averted Onsite Costs in Regulatory Analyses".

Following is our assessment of CRGR's review.

1. Value added by the CRGR Review - CRGR had no objection to the approach taken by the staff and raised no substantive differences with positions taken in either of the Commission papers. Consequently, improvements in terms of quality, completeness, and consistency with the Commission's policies were minimal.
2. Staff effort to address CRGR comments - Comments of a minor nature were offered relative to the Commission paper concerning voluntary initiatives. These comments were easily accommodated and required less than one hour of staff effort.
3. Impacts on schedules - none
4. Significance of Issues and associated costs - The CRGR review did not raise significant issues or result in meaningful costs. Nevertheless, RES found the CRGR review cost beneficial in that it provided a quality check and reexamination of the issues from a different and perhaps broadened perspective at minimal cost.

July 20, 2000

MEMORANDUM TO: Joseph A. Murphy, Chairman
Committee to Review Generic Requirements

FROM: Ashok Thadani, Director **/RA/**
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research

SUBJECT: FEEDBACK ON CRGR REVIEW

During CRGR Meeting No. 342, on June 22, 1999, RES briefed the CRGR on two Commission papers: "Treatment of Voluntary Initiatives in Regulatory Analyses" and "Treatment of Averted Onsite Costs in Regulatory Analyses".

Following is our assessment of CRGR's review.

1. Value added by the CRGR Review - CRGR had no objection to the approach taken by the staff and raised no substantive differences with positions taken in either of the Commission papers. Consequently, improvements in terms of quality, completeness, and consistency with the Commission's policies were minimal.
2. Staff effort to address CRGR comments - Comments of a minor nature were offered relative to the Commission paper concerning voluntary initiatives. These comments were easily accommodated and required less than one hour of staff effort.
3. Impacts on schedules - none
4. Significance of Issues and associated costs - The CRGR review did not raise significant issues or result in meaningful costs. Nevertheless, RES found the CRGR review cost beneficial in that it provided a quality check and reexamination of the issues from a different and perhaps broadened perspective at minimal cost.

Distribution

REAHFB R/F
CRGR R/F
RES-2000167
SRubin
PNorian

C:\crgrassess.wpd

OAR in ADAMS? (Y or N)	Y	Publicly Available? (Y or N)	Y
---------------------------	---	---------------------------------	---

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without attachment/enclosure "E" = Copy with attachment/enclosure
"N" = No copy

OFFICE	REAHFB	C	REAHFB:BC	C	DSARE:AD	C	RES:DD	C
NAME	SFeld:adl		JRosenthal		FEltawila		MFederline	
DATE	07/20/00*		07/20/00*		07/20/00*		07/20/00*	

Template= RES-006 Accession Number MI 003734263 RES File Code RES-7C1